REMARKS

Claims 2, 4-16, 18-19, and 21-45 are pending. Claims 2, 18, 36, 38, 40, 42, 43, and 45 are independent. Reconsideration of the action mailed May 17, 2007, is requested in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14, 16, 18-19, 25-27, 29, and 35-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0073157 ("Newman"). The Examiner rejected claims 7, 11, 15, and 30-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Newman. The Examiner rejected claims 21-23, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Newman in view of Venolia "Understanding Sequence and Reply Relationships within Email Conversations: A Mixed-Model Visualization" ("Venolia").

The Examiner has noted that claim 24 is objectionable as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's identification of allowable subject matter in claim 24.

Section 102 Rejections

Claim 2 stands rejected over Newman. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 2 is directed to a system for threading e-mail messages that includes creating an e-mail thread if a first e-mail message is determined to be related to a second e-mail message. The e-mail thread includes a thread header that has e-mail thread information derived from attributes of at least one of the e-mail messages in the e-mail thread. Information about received e-mail messages is displayed in a user interface. The thread header information is displayed in the user interface where the displayed thread header information is distinct from information displayed for individual e-mail messages and where the thread header information is displayed in the mailbox in place of mailbox entries for the first e-mail message and the second e-mail message associated with the e-mail thread. Thus, claim 2 recites that when the thread header information

is displayed <u>in the mailbox</u>, the entries for the first and second e-mail messages <u>are not displayed</u> <u>in the mailbox</u>.

The Examiner states that Newman discloses displaying thread header information in a mailbox in place of mailbox entries for a first and second e-mail message associated with the thread. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Newman discloses a system for stitching messages of a thread into a single message body. *See* Paragraph 11. For example, a conversation over a number of messages can be distilled into a single document showing the entire conversation in order. In particular, the Examiner identifies Paragraphs 46-48 as disclosing the claimed display of thread header information.

Paragraphs 46-48 of Newman disclose several example thread displays corresponding to FIGS. 3-7. FIG. 3 shows a conventional message that includes prior responses below. *See* Paragraph 46. FIGS. 4-5 show examples of a document that includes thread content with redundant information removed (e.g., extra headers, duplicate content). *See* paragraph 46. FIGS. 3-5 show techniques for displaying the content from several messages of a thread in a single document. However, FIGS. 3-5 and their corresponding text do not disclose or suggest a mailbox including mailbox entries. Furthermore, they do not disclose or suggest displaying thread header information in the mailbox in place of mailbox entries for the messages of the thread.

Paragraphs 47 and 48 correspond to FIGS. 6 and 7, which disclose additional thread displays. In FIGS. 6 and 7, a display is shown with two frames. The first frame includes a thread outline having a thread header followed by a listing of each message in the thread. The second frame displays the thread content as a single document similar to those shown in FIGS. 4-5. The user can select an individual message entry in the first frame in order to jump to that portion of the single document displayed in the second frame. *See* Paragraph 48.

The cited portions disclose displays specifically for showing threads and do not disclose a mailbox that includes thread header information. The first and second frames do not disclose or

suggest a mailbox having a thread header as an entry. The first pane is an outline of a thread while the second frame is a document containing all the thread content.

Furthermore, while the first frame includes a thread header, the first frame also displays an entry for each individual message of the thread. The Examiner states that "the first frame is displaying the e-mail headers without all of the content of the e-mails." However, claim 2 does not recite a requirement of displaying e-mail headers without all of the content of the e-mails. In contrast, claim 2 requires that the thread header information be displayed in place of mailbox entries for the e-mail messages associated with the thread. The cited portions of Newman do show entries for the individual e-mail messages of the thread listed (*e.g.,* in the order that they were received).

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2, as claims 8-12 and 35, which depend from claim 2, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 6 stands rejected over Newman. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 6 is directed to displaying a thread header that includes an indicia of the number of messages in the thread. The Examiner states that Newman discloses the claimed thread header as shown in FIGS. 6 and 7. Applicant respectfully disagrees. As set forth above, FIGS. 6 and 7 show example displays that include the thread outline in a first frame and the thread content as a single document in the second frame. The header for the thread outline in the first frame includes a subject of the thread and information on the originator of the thread (e.g., name and date of originating message). *See* FIG. 6. The header, however, does not include an indicia of the number of messages in the thread. Instead, each message in the thread is individually entered in the outline below the header. While the number of message entries in the outline indicates the number of messages in the thread, the header does not. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6 is allowable for at least this additional reason.

Claim 18 stands rejected over Newman. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 18 is directed to a method for threading e-mail messages that includes displaying thread header information in a user interface where the thread header information is displayed as in a mailbox in lieu of information for individual e-mail messages associated with the e-mail

Applicant : Forstall et al.   Attorney's Docket No.: 18962-034001 / P3193US1
Serial No. : 10/602,335
Filed   : June 23, 2003
Page   : 14 of 15

thread. For at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 2, claim 18 as well as claims 4-7 and 19-34, which depend from claim 18, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 36 stands rejected over Newman. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 36 is directed to a computer program product for threading e-mail messages that includes displaying the thread header information in a user interface where the thread header information is displayed in a mailbox in place of the information for each e-mail message associated with the e-mail thread. For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 2, claim 36 as well as claim 13-16 and 37, which depend from claim 36, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 38 stands rejected over Newman. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 38 is directed to a system for threading e-mail messages that includes a display means operable to display information about received e-mail messages in a user interface where the thread header information is displayed and where the thread header information is displayed as an entry in a mailbox in place of mailbox entries for each e-mail message associated with the e-mail thread. For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 2, claim 38 as well as claim 39, which depends from claim 38, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 40 stands rejected over Newman. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 40 is directed to a method for threading e-mail messages that includes creating an e-mail thread having a thread header and displaying the thread header as an entry in a mailbox. As set forth above, Newman does not disclose or suggest a displaying a thread header as an entry in a mailbox. For at least the reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 2, claim 40 as well as claim 41, which depends from claim 40, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 42 stands rejected over Newman. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 42 is directed to a method for threading e-mail messages that includes displaying a display item indicating a nature of the relationship between the first e-mail message and the second e-mail message and where the display item is displayed in a mailbox in place of mailbox entries for the first e-mail message and the second e-mail message. As discussed above, Newman does not disclose or suggest displaying information in place of entries for individual

e-mail messages. For at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 2, claim 42 is in condition for allowance.

   Claim 45 stands rejected over Newman. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

   Claim 45 is directed to a method that includes displaying a thread header as an entry in a mailbox in place of entries in the mailbox for the first e-mail message and the second e-mail message. For at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 2, claim 45 is in condition for allowance.

<div align="center">

Conclusion
</div>

   Applicant requests that all pending claims be allowed.

   By responding in the forgoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the Examiner, Applicant does no acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, Applicants' arguments for patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, Applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that Applicant agrees with any positions taken by the Examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

   The extension of time fees in the amount of $460 are being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

                    Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 17, 2007   /Brian J. Gustafson/
                  Brian J. Gustafson
                  Reg. No. 52,978

PTO Customer No. 26183
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50417635.doc